

The Witness: My best recollection is that I have referred to Mr. Peters quite a number of times and have discussed various aspects of his work in the United States as a Comintern representative and as an agent of the Soviet Secret Police. However, due to the tremendous volume of testimony, I cannot recall what I said specifically. The records will speak for themselves. Go to the records.

5212 The Witness: I described Mr. Peters' task as a CI representative and I will be very glad to read you now if you wish how I described his role which was recognized by the McCarran Committee as a description of him as a Comintern representative.

5213 Mr. LaFollette: Just read what is there now.

The Witness: I stated: "The vast majority of those persons who direct the United States branch of the Communist International are foreign-born persons who are not naturalized citizens of this country. Men like J. Peters; William Weiner, Jack Stachel, John Williamson, Bill Gebert—the latter now a high official of the Polish Government—are the men who really have run the Communist Party in this country in the past. Native-born and naturalized American Communists, in the main, are nominal party officials and are used mostly to head the various party fronts."

And I have to use the index to find out. On page 132 in describing his role as a Communist International representative—

5214 The Witness: I stated in answer to the question by Mr. Arens, "What would have happened had you disobeyed?"

"Mr. Crouch. My opinion is that I would have been imprisoned and probably shot.

"The Chairman. Go ahead.

"Mr. Crouch. The effort to save Eisler from even a short term in an American jail is striking indication of how important he is to the Russian Politburo. Gentlemen, Eisler was in this country for years. Peters, Weiner, Stachel, and other nonnaturalized citizens were the real heads of the Communist Party in this country, subject to Moscow's orders, of course. They were here for years without interference from the immigration authorities in this country, despite the constant efforts to build an apparatus for the overthrow of the Government."

And on page 138, in answer to a question by Senator Langer, I said: "Well, I might name, for example, such names as George Siskind. There are many other people, but most of my work in that period was in contact with top party leaders. Bill Gebert was one of those. When I went to New York, most of the time I was in New York was spent in discussions with Brown, whom I mentioned also by the name of Alpi, with Stachel, Weiner, Peters, and the various other men to whom I reported on the work I was doing, and received directions from them, discussed political line tactics, and things of that kind."

Then there is a reference also to him in connection with the Communist Party leadership which I don't think need read.

These are the references in connection with the Communist International.

By Mr. Marcantonio:

Q. These are the references you say were references to Peters as a Communist International representative, is that right, Mr. Witness? A. Yes.

Q. In this proceeding you were asked by Mr. McKittrick to mention the CI representatives that you knew, were you not, in this proceeding here? A. I don't recall the formulation of the question.

Q. In giving the names of CI representatives in this proceeding you mentioned Mr. Peters specifically as a CI representative, did you not? A. I only spoke of him as a

special kind. I distinguished him from the people who are ordinarily identified as Comintern representatives. I identified the Comintern representatives in substance as I recall my testimony, I said there are other kinds of special representatives, people like Peters. That is as near as I can recall the general substance of it.

5216 Q. You didn't mention in that category men like Stachel, Weiner, Peters, did you? A. I cited Peters as an example.

Q. Did you mention Stachel and Weiner? A. I certainly didn't go down the list of all the people who played a part in the Comintern apparatus in this country.

Q. I am not asking you about playing a part in the Comintern apparatus. I am asking you specifically as CI representatives. A. I made it clear in my testimony that there is a great difference between the kind of CI representatives; that Gerhardt Eisler, alias Edwards, Harry Pollitt, and Dingle, who speak in the name of the Communist International, are quite distinct from the large number of special agents, and I identified Gibarti as examples of the special agents. If I had to list all the special agents, I would have added a tremendous amount of additional detail to the record.

5221 Q. Did you mention in that list the names of Alpi, Stachel and Weiner? A. No. They wouldn't have belonged there. They belonged in an entirely separate classification of Comintern agents, in connection with Comintern work, separate even from Peters.

5223 Q. Mr. Witness, you have testified here, have you not, to the effect that the Communist Party through its officials and in your personal instance while you were a member advocated the overthrow of the Government by force and violence? A. Yes, sir; I so testified, at least in substance and words to that effect.

Vol. II
TRANSCRIPT OF RECORD

(Pages 483 to 997)

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1955

No. 48

**COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES OF
AMERICA, PETITIONER,**

vs.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

**ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT**

PETITION FOR CERTIORARI FILED APRIL 11, 1956

CERTIORARI GRANTED MAY 11, 1956

INDEX

	Vol.	Page
I. Pleadings, Opinions, and Orders	I	
Report of the Board	I	1
Order of the Board (Requiring Registration)	I	138
Petition for Review	I	139
Petition of Attorney General to Board ...	I	143
Answer	I	160
Amended Answer	I	177
Motion for the Disqualification of Dr. Kathryn McHale	I	187
Affidavit of Bias and Prejudice (re Dr. McHale)	I	187
Opinion and Order of the Board (Denying Motion for Disqualification of Dr. McHale)	I	190
Motion to Disqualify Board Chairman Peter Campbell Brown	I	196
Affidavit of Bias and Prejudice (re Board Chairman Brown)	I	197
Motion to Re-open Hearing Before Panel..	I	199
Affidavit in Support of Motion to Re-open Hearing	I	200
Affidavit of Peter Campbell Brown	I	206
Memorandum Opinion and Order of the Board	I	209
Memorandum Opinion and Order of the Board	I	211

II. Excerpts from Testimony and Proceedings:

Witnesses:

Herbert Aptheker—

Direct Examination	III	1257
Cross Examination	III	1305

Bereniece Baldwin—

Direct Examination	III	1000
Cross Examination	III	1015

John Victor Blanc—

Direct Examination	II	784
Redirect Examination	II	813

Louis Francis Budenz—

Direct Examination	III	1114
Cross Examination	III	1178
Redirect Examination	III	1194

Paul Crouch—

Direct Examination	I	400
Cross Examination	I	455

William Garfield Cummings—

Direct Examination	II	814
Direct Examination—resumed	II	845

Timothy Evans, Jr.—

Direct Examination	III	1092
Cross Examination	III	1113

Elizabeth Gurley Flynn—

Direct Examination	III	1275
Cross Examination	III	1297

John Gates—

Direct Examination	III	1199
Cross Examination	III	1242

Index Continued

iii

Witnesses:

Vol. Page

Benjamin Gitlow—

Direct Examination	I	216
Cross Examination	I	273
Redirect Examination	I	299

Balmes Hidalgo—

Direct Examination	II	866
--------------------------	----	-----

Nathaniel Honig—

Direct Examination	II	464
Cross Examination	II	502
Redirect Examination	II	506

John Edward Janowitz—

Direct Examination	III	1016
Cross Examination	III	1023

Manning Johnson—

Direct Examination	II	647
Cross Examination	II	669

Joseph Zack Kornfedder—

Direct Examination	I	301
Cross Examination	I	340
Redirect Examination	I	351

John Lautner—

Direct Examination	II	873
Cross Examination	II	979
Redirect Examination	II	993

Mary Stalcup Markward—

Direct Examination	II	734
Cross Examination	II	749

Harvey M. Matusow—

Direct Examination	III	1024
Cross Examination	III	1057

Witnesses:	Vol.	Page
Frank Strauss Meyer—		
Direct Examination	II	679
Direct Examination—resumed	II	729
Cross Examination	II	733
Philip E. Mosely—		
Direct Examination	II	507
Direct Examination—resumed	II	707
Cross Examination	II	836
Cross Examination—resumed	II	856
William Odell Nowell—		
Direct Examination	I	352
Herbert A. Philbrick—		
Direct Examination	II	752
Daniel Scarletto—		
Direct Examination	III	1058
Cross Examination	III	1091
III. Exhibits	III	
Petitioner's Exhibit*		
No. 4A	III	1317
No. 4D	III	1317
No. 8	III	1318
No. 11	III	1332
No. 12	III	1333
No. 13	III	1334
No. 23	III	1337
No. 24	III	1338
No. 28A	III	1339
No. 31	III	1339
No. 32A	III	1342
No. 39	III	1343
No. 40	III	1351
No. 43	III	1352
No. 44	III	1355
No. 47	III	1356

* "Petitioner's exhibit" refers to the exhibits introduced by the Attorney General, the petitioner in the proceeding before the Board.

Index Continued

v

(Exhibits Continued)	Vol.	Page
No. 50	III	1357
No. 51	III	1358
No. 53	III	1359
No. 58	III	1360
No. 59	III	1362
No. 60	III	1364
No. 63	III	1364
No. 65	III	1367
No. 69	III	1370
No. 71	III	1373
No. 72	III	1374
No. 73	III	1378
No. 74	III	1378
No. 75	III	1384
No. 76	III	1386
No. 77	III	1387
No. 80	III	1389
No. 83	III	1394
No. 84	III	1395
No. 87	III	1396
No. 89	III	1401
No. 91	III	1404
No. 95	III	1406
No. 97	III	1409
No. 96	III	1407
No. 98	III	1410
No. 99	III	1416
No. 101	III	1417
No. 102A	III	1418
No. 103A	III	1418
No. 103B	III	1419
No. 104	III	1420
No. 105	III	1421
No. 108	III	1422
No. 109	III	1424
No. 117	III	1425
No. 121	III	1427
No. 123	III	1444
No. 125	III	1446
No. 126	III	1473
No. 132	III	1483

Index Continued

(Exhibits Continued)

Vol. Page

No. 133	III	1486
No. 135	III	1488
No. 136	III	1490
No. 137	III	1493
No. 138	IV	1500
No. 140	IV	1518
No. 142	IV	1522
No. 143	IV	1523
No. 144	IV	1525
No. 145	IV	1533
No. 147	IV	1543
No. 148	IV	1543
No. 149	IV	1545
No. 150	IV	1548
No. 151	IV	1550
No. 157	IV	1551
No. 158	IV	1559
No. 159	IV	1562
No. 160	IV	1562
No. 162	IV	1564
No. 183	IV	1565
No. 185	IV	1567
No. 205	IV	1572
No. 206	IV	1573
No. 207	IV	1573
No. 208	IV	1574
No. 214	IV	1575
No. 217	IV	1578
No. 219	IV	1581
No. 231	IV	1582
No. 249	IV	1584
No. 251	IV	1586
No. 258	IV	1592
No. 264	IV	1594
No. 269	IV	1595
No. 270	IV	1596
No. 292	IV	1597
No. 294	IV	1601
No. 296	IV	1601
No. 323	IV	1609
No. 329	IV	1611
No. 330	IV	1613

(Exhibits Continued)

Vol. Page

No. 331	IV	1632
No. 332	IV	1634
No. 333	IV	1635
No. 334	IV	1637
No. 335	IV	1643
No. 338	IV	1645
No. 339	IV	1645
No. 343	IV	1647
No. 344	IV	1659
No. 346	IV	1663
No. 348	IV	1664
No. 349	IV	1669
No. 350	IV	1671
No. 353	IV	1671
No. 361	IV	1671
No. 362	IV	1672
No. 363	IV	1673
No. 367	IV	1676
No. 369	IV	1677
No. 370	IV	1680
No. 373	IV	1694
No. 374	IV	1695
No. 375	IV	1706
No. 376	IV	1707
No. 377	IV	1719
No. 378	IV	1721
No. 379	IV	1724
No. 380A	IV	1726
No. 380B	IV	1727
No. 380C	IV	1728
No. 389	IV	1729
No. 400	IV	1731
No. 412	IV	1732
No. 416	IV	1733
No. 418	IV	1740
No. 419	IV	1743
No. 420	IV	1744
No. 421	IV	1744
No. 422	IV	1746
No. 423	IV	1749
No. 424	IV	1751
No. 425	IV	1753

Index Continued

(Exhibits Continued)	Vol.	Page
No. 427	IV	1754
No. 428	IV	1757
No. 430	IV	1759
No. 432	IV	1762
No. 433	IV	1763
No. 436	IV	1765
No. 440	IV	1768
No. 451	IV	1770
No. 455	IV	1771
No. 467	IV	1772
No. 468	IV	1773
No. 477	IV	1773
No. 479	IV	1777
No. 480	IV	1778
No. 488	IV	1779
No. 493	IV	1782
No. 495	IV	1797
No. 496	IV	1798

IN THE
United States Court of Appeals

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

—
No. 11,850
—

COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES OF
AMERICA, *Petitioner,*

v.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD,
Respondent.

—
On Petition to Review and Set Aside an Order of the
Subversive Activities Control Board

—
JOINT APPENDIX
—

VOLUME II

(Pages 463 to 997)

6105 **Nathaniel Honig** was called as witness by and on behalf of Petitioner, and having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

Direct Examination

6119 Q. Did you have an official title during the time you worked on the staff of the Daily Worker? A. Yes. After the first few days I was made make-up editor of the Daily Worker, and then I had another title later of labor editor.

Q. What were your duties as labor editor of the Daily Worker? A. I was in charge of all news relating to trade union questions, and I also was in charge of a section of the paper called "The Workers' Corner".

When I became in charge of that it was a full page in the paper devoted to letters from readers of the paper.

Q. Mr. Honig, was the Daily Worker an official publication of the Communist Party of the United States during the time you worked on the paper? A. It was.

6120 Q. How do you know that the Daily Worker was the official publication of the Communist Party?

A. I as well as other members of the staff received instructions on material to be printed in the Daily Worker and material that was not to go in the Daily Worker.

6121 I was also, as a matter of fact, just as another way of knowing, told by Robert Minor, the editor of the Daily Worker, that it was an official organ of the Communist Party.

Q. You mentioned that you received instructions. Do you recall any of the persons that issued instructions during the time that you were a member of the staff? A. Yes. At first instructions would be sent down from J. Lovestone, who was then Secretary of the Communist Party, and Benjamin Gitlow, I believe, was the assistant Secretary of the Party. I don't remember his exact title. He was

second in command. Orders would come from him. Sometimes he would come in and sort of brief us on certain current situations of the day.

Q. Did any members of the staff of the Daily Worker object to publishing any of the material they received from the Communist Party leaders?

The Witness: I never knew of any member of the staff of the Daily Worker to refuse to carry out any instructions as to what was to go in the paper, instructions that came from the Central Committee or any of the officials of the Communist Party.

Q. Were any members of the staff of the Daily Worker fired during the time you were a member of the staff of the Daily Worker? A. I recall one.

Q. Do you recall the name of this person? A. John Sherman.

Q. Why was he fired, if you know? A. Yes. He was fired for printing—he was at that time labor editor; it was shortly after I became a member of the staff—he was fired for allowing an article to go into his section of the paper which was deemed by the Party against the line of the Party.

6123 Q. Mr. Honig, did you receive any instructions from the leaders of the Communist Party of the United States during the time you were editor of Labor Unity? A. Frequently.

Q. Do you recall the names of any of the persons that you received instructions from? A. Well, in the first place, from William Z. Foster, who was a member of the Political Bureau of the Communist Party, and he was also Secretary of the Trade Union Unity League. From—I don't re-

6124 call names at the moment of any others. From Jack

Stachel, who was a member of the Political Bureau at that time. I do remember specifically from him.

Q. Mr. Honig, you have testified that you were the editor of Labor Unity until May 1934. What did you do after May 1934? A. I was sent by the Communist Party of the United States to the Soviet Union.

Q. How long did you remain in the Soviet Union? A. From June 1934 until September 1935.

Q. Did you return to the United States in 1935? A. Yes.

Q. What did you do after you returned to the United States in 1935? A. For a short period from November 1935 until March 1936, I worked in the district apparatus of the Communist Party in New York; that is in the district headquarters.

Q. How long did you work there? A. From November 1935 until about March 1936.

Q. Where did you go in March 1936? A. To San Francisco. I was sent there to be editor of the Western Worker.

Q. What was the Western Worker, Mr. Honig? A. It was the official organ of the Communist Party for the Pacific Coast.

Q. Did you receive any instructions from the Communist Party of the United States on what was to be published in the Western Worker? A. Yes. During my employment on the Western Worker, I did.

6138 Q. What did Golos tell you concerning your trip to the Soviet Union? A. Of Course, the first thing I asked Golos was, when I would get the ticket and when I was supposed to leave, and Golos told me this. I asked him about the ticket, where I would obtain it. He said not to worry about that, that he would take care of that, he would buy the ticket, that is, he would see that the ticket was bought, he would have it for me well in time for the sailing, and that he would see that arrangements were made for me to get expense money on the way over.

Q. Did you obtain an American passport for this trip?
A. Yes.

Q. Did you apply for your American passport in your own name? A. Yes.

Q. Did you obtain any visas prior to the time you left the United States? A. I obtained some from Golos.

6139 Q. What do you mean you obtained them from Golos? A. No. I guess I didn't obtain them from him. He had talked himself of making the arrangements to get them. Now, as I recall, I went and got the visas from three or four consulates myself. He told me what consulates to get them from, what countries I might pass through possibly.

Q. Do you recall what countries you received them from? A. British, French, Polish and German. I remember them.

Q. Did you get a visa for the Soviet Union? A. No, I didn't. That is, I didn't get a visa in my passport for the Soviet Union, not in that form.

Q. In what form did you receive your visa for the Soviet Union? A. I asked Golos about that when he told me to go to the other consulates and get visas for those countries, and he said never mind about that, he would obtain something for me that would be the equivalent but they didn't want my passport to show I was going to Russia and the Soviet Union, and therefore there would be no visa in the passport for the Soviet Union. So he gave me a little piece of silk, it was a little square piece of silk, I guess no more than an inch square, and he said he would have this sewed in a tie.

Mr. LaFollette: In what?

The Witness: Sewed in the inside of a tie where it would be concealed by the outer part of the tie, and he told
6140 me I would board a Soviet ship in London for Lenin-grad and when I got on the ship I would identify myself by showing this thing to some official aboard that ship.

By Mr. Story:

Q. What was on this piece of silk, if you recall? A. It was in Russian writing, and it also had my name in Russian and in English. I don't remember the exact wording. At that time I could not read any Russian. Golos told me that it merely served to identify me, that is all.

Q. Did you use this form of visa when you boarded the Soviet ship? A. Yes, I showed that to a man on the ship, I don't remember who it was, of course, but he had the uniform of a ship's officer, and I was introduced to him by another man on the ship. The man who introduced me said that this man was in charge of the political activities on the ship. I showed him that. I had been told by Golos to show it to such a man and I did.

Q. Where did you board the Soviet vessel? A. In London.

Q. Did Soviet officials on the boat ask you for your American passport? A. Yes, they asked me for it, and I gave it to them. They kept it until my arrival in Leningrad.

Q. Did you receive any funds for this trip? A. 6141 Any what? Beg pardon?

Q. Any money or funds for this trip to the Soviet Union? A. Yes, I received some cash, a couple of hundred dollars for expenses.

Q. Where did you get this money? A. I was told by Golos to obtain it from William Wiener, who was the treasurer or secretary treasurer of the Communist Party. I don't remember which title he used. Financial director was the title as I recall it.

Q. Did Merker tell you anything about your expenses for your trip over your expenses while you were in the Soviet Union when he talked to you? A. He didn't say anything about the expenses on the boat going over, but he did say that my expenses would be paid by the Red Internationale of Labor Unions, that is, I would be paid a salary and living expenses.

Q. Mr. Honig, what did you do with your American passport when you arrived in Moscow? A. When I arrived at

Moscow I went to the Red Internationale of Labor Unions, I went to Mr. Lozosfsky, who was the head of the Red Internationale of Labor Unions and he asked me to give him my passport. He said that the Red Internationale of Labor Unions would keep my passport for the duration of my stay there, I gave it to him.

.

6157 Q. Mr. Honig, you have testified that you were employed by the Red Internationale of Labor Unions in Moscow. What were your duties when you first arrived in Moscow to work with the Red Internationale of Labor Unions? A. My first duties when I had the title of referant were merely to go through reports that came from the United States from the Communist Party and sift out any information relating to trade unions, to go through the various publications that were sent us from the United States that the Internationale of Labor Unions subscribed for from the United States and digest out of that information relating to trade unions in the United States, and from that to make reports to the Red Internationale of Labor Unions on the trade unions in the United States. They were my first duties.

Q. How long did you continue as a referant at the Red Internationale of Labor Unions? A. For about three
6158 months.

Q. What were your duties after that time? A. Then I was raised to the position of representative of the Trade Union Unity League, and the Communist Party of the United States to the Red Internationale of Labor Unions.

Q. What were your duties as the official representative of the Communist Party of the United States to the Red Internationale of Labor Unions? A. My duties became not merely to digest these reports that were sent over from the American Party and information I had obtained from the publications that we received there, but then also I attended

meetings at the Comintern itself, at the Communist Internationale Building itself, each week, and participated there in helping to formulate policies which were to be carried out by the American Communist Party in the trade union field.

Q. You mentioned reports you received from the Communist Party of the United States. What kind of reports did you receive? A. Sometimes they were just simply mimeographed reports. When the information was not of any great confidential nature they were merely mimeographed reports or typed reports that were sometimes even sent in the regular mail, but very often brought over by American Party leaders or students from the United States who were going to study in Moscow brought them to the

6159 Internationale of Labor Unions. Sometimes they were brought over by couriers. If the information was of a more confidential nature, if the reports referred to matters that the Party didn't want known outside of the top Party leadership, then of course they were brought over by couriers or by top Communist Party leaders who may at that time have been visiting the Soviet Union.

Q. Did you attend any meetings of the Red Internationale of Labor Unions? A. Yes. At least one meeting of all representatives from the various Communist Parties throughout the world, at least one meeting of such representatives was held each week in the Red Internationale of Labor Unions Building.

Q. What took place at these meetings? A. At these meetings, in the first place, various delegates, various representatives from different countries of the world, from the Communist Parties of those different countries would get up and give reports on the work their parties were doing among the trade union members in their countries. Then discussions would take place among various delegates based on the various reports that had been given.

Then there are always two or three leaders from the Comintern, from the Communist Internationale, that would come over to attend these meetings of the Red Internationale of Labor Unions, and they would get up and give their opinions of the work that was being carried on by the Communist Parties in these various countries in the trade unions. They would express whether they thought such work was being properly carried out in accordance with instructions that had been previously sent from the Comintern, that is the Communist Internationale, or they would express either approval or disapproval or dissatisfaction with the progress of such work being carried on by the various Communist Parties.

Then there would be more discussion on their opinions. Of course, there was—I don't remember any disagreement on the part of these delegates, us delegates from the various Communist Parties of the rest of the world, any disagreements with what was expressed by these men from the Comintern. Generally we would get up and admit our errors or the errors of our parties, and promise to rectify these errors.

Q. Mr. Honig, what countries were represented at the Red Internationale of Labor Unions? A. Of course, the United States and every English speaking country that I can think of, England, and all the British Colonies of the Dominions and the United States. These were represented in the section that I worked in. That was the Anglo-American Secretariat of the Red Internationale of Labor Unions. Then of course there were also representatives from every Latin American country, and they were in a Latin American department of the Red Internationale of Labor Unions. Every European country that I know of had a representative there. A number of the Asiatic Countries, Indo-China, India, China, Japan, there was a representative from the Philippines, and they were in the Far Eastern section or secretariat of the Red Internationale of Labor Unions.

Then there were delegates from scattered other areas, some of the countries in Africa and a few other lesser known countries or smaller countries throughout the world.

Q. Mr. Honig, you have mentioned attending meetings once a week at the Communist Internationale Building. What type of meeting was this? A. Such a meeting was similar to what we had at the Red Internationale of Labor Unions except that they took in more scope, they took in more territory. In addition to the question of trade union work by the various Communist Parties we discussed, also they discussed broader political activities, such as elections that were being held in various countries and what Communist Parties of those countries were to do in those elections. Whether in some cases, like in the United States, they were to maybe run a candidate masked as a socialist—we had such a discussion at one time—or say in another locality in an election in the United States to run a Communist openly as a Communist, if it were deemed feasible.

Whether in another case they would have him pose
6162 as a Democrat or Republican, and similar questions on other questions on elections.

Then of course there were other broad political issues that were discussed, such as what to do about various other antiparty movements that were occurring in some countries.

Well, all sorts of general political questions which concerned the Communist Internationale.

Q. Was the entire membership represented at these meetings at the Comintern which you attended each week? A. You mean were all the representatives from the various countries—

Q. Yes. A. Not always. In fact, not usually. Sometimes one might be sent to some other part of the Soviet Union for some purpose. Once in a while I myself was sent elsewhere either to learn more how the Soviet Union operated, how various phases of socialistic activities were carried on Soviet activities, that is, were carried on in the Soviet Union; or to study the operations of Soviet trade

unions and so forth. Pretty nearly always one or another or more of we delegates were away from Moscow at any particular meeting. So we never had all of them, but usually most of the delegates were present.

Q. Did any other members of the American Communist Party attend these meetings? A. At the Red Internationale of Labor Unions, yes, we had the American representative who was my counterpart. He was the American representative to the Comintern itself. I was the representative to the Red Internationale of Labor Unions, and he to the Communist Internationale. He would come over and attend our meetings at the Red Internationale of Labor Unions Building just as I would go over and attend their meetings.

Q. Do you recall the name of this representative? A. William Schneiderman.

Q. Mr. Honig, you have mentioned that you received certain publications while you were in Moscow which you read and in turn analyzed the trade union articles for the Red Internationale of Labor Unions. What publications did you receive from the United States? A. There were non-party and party publications, of course. For instance, I got them to subscribe to the New York Times. They had not been doing it up to then. I deemed it very necessary to have the New York Times there, because it did print a great mass of news that I could not obtain otherwise. They reported on all phases of activities, I thought, fully. So I got that.

I remember I even got them to subscribe to a few what we call fascist publications that were published at that time in the United States. I don't remember the title. There 6164 was a magazine, a monthly issued by a man named Laurence Dennis who was starting what he called openly a fascist movement. I asked them to subscribe to that so we could know what they were planning and talking about, what this movement was talking about, and such things. Of course, all Party publications were sent over.

Q. Will you please name for the Panel the Communist Party publications that you received while you were in Moscow? A. The Daily Worker, the New Masses, the Communist, all books and pamphlets that were published by the International Publishers, which was one of the Communist Party publishing firms. All pamphlets published by the Workers Library Publishers, and the Western Worker. That about covers it I think.

Q. Mr. Honig, what type of couriers were used to bring these reports to the Soviet Union? A. Various types of people were used as couriers. In the first place, there were what you might call professional couriers, professional in the sense that that was their sole duty, to be sent to various countries throughout the world and carry messages or money or instructions to Communist Parties in various countries. Then whenever—

Mr. LaFollette: Excuse me. I didn't quite hear you. Did you say there were or were not such?

The Witness: There were.

6165 That was one type. Whenever any top party leader, such as Earl Browder, the Secretary of the Party, would make frequent visits, at least once or twice a year, to the Comintern, he would generally take back instructions and other data to the Party in the United States from the Comintern, and from the Red Internationale of Labor Unions, too.

Then there were students at what was called the Lenin School in Moscow. The United States Party and the United States Young Communist League had a number of students at that school, and when they finished their terms at the school and were homeward bound, they too would take with them such material as I have mentioned.

By Mr. Story:

Q. Were these students used to bring reports from the United States to Russia? A. Yes.

6169 Q. Mr. Honig, you were discussing the types of couriers that were used to bring messages from the United States to the Soviet Union. You have testified that students to the Lenin School were used, and also the leaders of the Communist Party of the United States when they made trips to the Soviet Union. Were there other types of couriers used to your knowledge?

A. Yes. People like myself, who were employed in Moscow, as representatives of the Communist Party were occasionally sent out as couriers. I would say in addition also, although that wasn't their main purpose, representatives of the Communist Internationale who were sent to the United States and to other countries, but I know personally those who were sent to the United States, they too would also act as couriers as long as they were going to the United States or returning to Moscow from the United States.

Q. Did you prepare any reports that were to be sent back to the United States while you were in Moscow?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you personally deliver any of these reports to any couriers for transmission back to the United States?

A. Yes, I did. I delivered some of that material myself to Jack Stachel, whom I mentioned, when he was there, once. Although he was not there mainly to be a courier, he was to act as a courier on his return.

6171 I delivered such material also to a student of the Lenin School, to several students of the Lenin School, as a matter of fact, whose terms were up. I gave them that material which they were to take back with them.

Q. What type of material did you give these couriers to bring back to the United States? A. They were reports on development, for instance, of strike activities in various industries of the United States, reports on decisions that had been made either at the Comintern meetings I have described, or the Red Internationale of Labor Union meet-

ings I have described, as to where the Party was to step up its activities and try to produce strikes and try to capture control of unions by the Communist Party.

6173 Q. Were the directives received by the Communist Party of the United States from the Red Internationale of Labor Unions carried out by the Communist Party in the United States? A. Yes.

Q. How did you gain this information? A. I was then editor of Labor Unity, the official organ of the Trade Union Unity League, and the executive board of the Trade Union Unity League held meetings at least once a week at the Trade Union Unity League, and it was mandatory for me to be present at every such meeting so I would know how to reflect the policies discussed in the magazine that I edited. It was at such a meeting that this particular matter here was discussed, and it was at subsequent meetings 6174 that reports were received and discussed as to whether this was being carried out. I was present when these were done.

6180 Q. Mr. Honig, do you recall any specific directive which was issued to the Communist Party of the United States from the Communist International or from the Red Internationale of Labor Unions while you were in Moscow? A. Yes, I recall a number of such directives.

Q. Can you give us any specific directive that was 6181 issued? A. One such directive I recall distinctly is in connection with the work of the Communist Party and the Trade Union Unity League among the unemployed.

Q. Mr. Honig, where did you receive these instructions? A. On the unemployed?

Q. Yes. A. I didn't receive the instructions, that is, the instructions were transmitted from the Red Internationale

of Labor Unions and the Communist Internationale to the Communist Party of the United States.

Q. Did you assist in preparing any of these directives that went back to the Communist Party in the United States? A. Yes, I did, specifically that directive.

Mr. LaFollette: On this subject of the unemployed?

The Witness: Yes.

Mr. LaFollette: Was it in writing at the time you prepared it?

The Witness: I prepared it in writing. I prepared my version of it in writing, but then it was discussed at one of these meetings of the Internationale of Labor Unions. Then the directive which was sent was sent through a courier, I don't know which courier, but it was decided that the directive would be sent through a courier.

Did you ever receive a report back from the United States in your capacity which you then held while you were in Moscow with reference to any action in connection with this directive that you issued?

The Witness: Yes, I did.

6189 Q. What happened to these directives after you had written them up before they were sent to the United States? A. All directives formulated at the RILU, whether mine or anybody else's, whether I participated in them or anybody else, from any country, had to be okayed in the Comintern before they could be transmitted to the respective countries. That was true of directives that I participated in formulating in the RILU. In my case they had to be okayed by the Anglo-American Secretariat of the Comintern.

Q. And did the Communist Party of the United States have a representative in that group? A. Yes, it did.

Q. What was the name of that person? A. That was William Schneiderman.

Q. You were testifying about another specific directive you recalled. Was this directive issued by the Communist Internationale or the Red Internationale of Labor Unions?

A. This was issued by the Communist Internationale itself, this other directive.

Q. Will you tell the Panel what this directive was?
6190 A. It was ~~the directive applying to a general strike~~ in San Francisco in 1934.

Q. When did you first hear of the discussion on this directive. A. In one of the first meetings that I attended after my arrival at Moscow at the RILU, Lozofsky, himself, who was the Secretary General of the RILU, said that reports had been received—I am not quoting his exact words, but this was the gist of it—that reports had been received there at the RILU that the work among the longshoremen and dock workers in San Francisco by the Communist Party was producing good results, and he wanted to see that that work would be fully supported, fully backed in every way, by the Red Internationale of Labor Unions. He wanted to see more discussion. He asked for more discussion on the San Francisco situation and he asked for fuller reports. He said that he had sent to the United States for fuller reports.

At subsequent meetings he made this the main point on our agenda for a number of weeks. We held these meetings at least once a week, and often twice a week. The first time I heard about it was in June 1934, early in June 1934. He considered this matter of such importance because of the reports he had received from the United States, that is, from the Party in the United States, on that, that he even called extra meetings each week during June on the subject.

6191 The Comintern became interested. He said he had reported to the Anglo-American section of the Comintern. He considered this work from such great importance from the reports he had received that he wanted the Comintern to participate in joint meetings with the

RILU on this matter. We had not had such joint meetings. We just had our separate meetings. At the Cominform they were very enthused about the reports Lozosfsky gave. The Anglo-American section of the Comintern said, or thought from the reports that Lozosfsky showed them that the situation was rapidly developing—I think this is almost exact quotes of the two heads of the Anglo-American Secretariat—to the point where they thought a general strike was possible at San Francisco, at least on the waterfront, and possibly in all San Francisco.

Q. Were any instructions or directives issued out of all of these discussions that you had to the Communist Party in the United States? A. Yes. Instructions were issued. Lozosfsky reported at these joint meetings of the Comintern and the RILU Anglo-American Secretariats, that he and the heads of the Anglo-American Secretariat in the Comintern had sent instructions—

.
The Witness:—had sent instructions to the 6192 Political Bureau of the American Party that they considered this situation there ripe for a general strike in San Francisco on the basis of reports they were getting from the Party.

By Mr. Story:

Q. Did you participate in drawing up any instructions concerning the general strike in San Francisco? A. Yes, I did.

Q. About when was that? A. That was in June 1934.

Q. What were these directives? A. I could give you the gist or the sense of them.

.
Q. Where did you receive these instructions? A. I don't quite know what you mean by instructions.

Q. Were you told to prepare any directives to the Communist Party in the United States? A. I see. Not quite

in that way. What happened actually was that at these joint meetings of the Comintern and the Red Internationale of Labor Unions, it was decided to draw up official instructions from the Comintern itself instructing the
 6193 American Party to press the situation in San Francisco to the point of a general strike. I simply participated in actual oral discussion. I did not write the instructions in this case, but I helped to draft the instructions that were to be sent.

Q. In other words, you did assist in drafting the instructions. A. That is right.

Q. Were these instructions communicated to the Communist Party in the United States? A. Yes, they were.

Q. How were they communicated?

* * * * *
 6194 The Witness: They were communicated in this particular case by a coded message. * * *

* * * * *
 6195 Did you receive any reports after this instruction went out on the subject of this general strike from the United States?

The Witness: I didn't receive them directly, but I saw copies of such reports sent to the Comintern.

Mr. LaFollette: What did they say?

The Witness: They said that the Party agreed in the United States that a general strike was very possible now in San Francisco, and that the Party was trying to carry such a strike out.

Mr. LaFollette: When was this?

The Witness: This was towards the end of June, probably the last week of June that the Party replied.

Mr. LaFollette: What year.

The Witness: 1934.

By Mr. Story:

Q. Tell me what is meant by general strike. A. A general strike as the Party means it and as I always under-

stood it as a Party member, was meant it can be a strike in which an entire industry is crippled and the workers in an entire industry participate, or it can mean a strike where the workers in all industries, trade or particular locality, or even in a particular country take part.

Q. Did you read anything in the Daily Worker concerning the general strike in San Francisco while you were in Moscow? A. Yes, I did, in 1934.

6202 Q. Did Mingulin make any other statement concerning the general strike in San Francisco. A. Among other things he said was that he knew that the American Federation of Labor reactionary leaders, as he called them, would be reluctant, and would oppose such a thing, but he thought that due to the effective work of the Party and due to the effective work particularly of Harry Bridges—he mentioned Bridges' name as he had
6203 received reports—due to that, he thought that the workers, that the Party in America could force the A.F.L. leaders through Party pressure among the union members to call such a strike.

He warned, too, that because of their reluctance that these, as he called them, reactionary leaders would try to scuttle such a strike as quickly as they could. He said the mere calling of that strike would not be enough. The important thing would be to prevent the American Federation of Labor leaders, specifically the Central Labor Council of San Francisco, from killing that strike off.

The Witness: Another thing he said was that the Comintern was particularly anxious, and he said he had discussed this with Manuilsky, who was then the Secretary General of the Communist Internationale, the Comintern, that Manuilsky was particularly anxious to have this strike because the Comintern wanted to see one of the cardinal lessons of Comrade Lenin, as he said, carried out here. He

pointed out to us who were listening to him then that the cardinal principle of Leninism was that a general strike is a rehearsal for a revolution or for a seizure of power by the Communist Party. He said that such a rehearsal is now possible in the United States.

6204 Mr. LaFollette: Where did this conversation take place with reference to the strike?

The Witness: This one was in the Comintern Building.

Mr. LaFollette: I mean with reference to the date of the strike.

The Witness: I see. This was in the middle of June 1934, this particular one.

By Mr. Story:

Q. Was this conversation prior to the time the instructions were sent to the Communist Party in the United States? A. Instructions were continually being sent during the month of June on the speeding of that strike, so that it was not prior to the first instructions. But further instructions were sent after that conversation.

6206 Q. Mr. Honig, I think in response to my last question you said you taught at the Lenin School, is that correct? A. Yes, I taught at the Lenin School.

Q. What classes did you teach at the Lenin School? A. I taught labor journalism and I taught a course in the history of the American labor movement.

Q. How many students did you have in your class? A. I had a selected group of American students in my class. I had somewhere between 15 and 20.

Q. You say these were all members of the Communist Party of the United States? A. Either that or of the Young Communist League of the United States.

Q. When did you start your teaching at the Lenin School? A. I can't tell you the exact date on that, but it was in the fall of '34.

Q. How long did you teach? A. I had a six months course in each of those subjects.

Q. How did you receive your assignment to teach
6207 at the Lenin School in Moscow? A. This Mingulin and Mehring both, the co-heads of the Anglo-American section of the Comintern, assigned me to that.

Q. Where were these classes held? A. They were held in a building devoted to the Lenin School.

Q. How long did the American students from the Communist Party of the United States remain at the Lenin School? A. I can't tell exactly, but I know that a number of them remained at least two years, because the way I could tell that was that they were there when I arrived, and they were still there when I was leaving Moscow for my return to the United States, and I was there 18 months, or about 18 months.

Q. What nationalities were represented by the students at the Lenin School? A. Of course in the class I taught there were only Americans. There were students from every country in the world which had a Communist Party, and a few countries where they had not yet organized a party, but there was a nucleus of a Communist Party. Every nationality in Europe, that is, from every nation in Europe, and virtually every nation in Latin America, Mexico, Central and South America, and I met students from all these places, and a great number of students from the Far East, from China and Japan particularly, and a few from
6208 India. Of course, from Britain and the British colonies, Canada, and so forth.

Q. Mr. Honig, were you familiar with the other subjects that were taught at the Lenin School?

.
The Witness: Yes. Revolutionary tactics was the major subject, and Leninism, Marxism, and of course the subjects I taught. They were among the leading ones.

By Mr. Story:

6209 Q. Do you recall the names of any of the text books that were used by the students in the Lenin School? A. Lenin's "Imperialism" was one. All the works of Lenin were used from time to time. Lenin's "Imperialism" was very much used. A pamphlet by Lenin, or a booklet by Lenin called "Infantile Leftism" was a very important pamphlet or booklet. Another work of Lenin which was very important for these students was one called, "What is to be done?" Of course, I used textbooks in my courses. I used one, "The History of the American Working Class" by Anthony Bimba, among others.

Q. Who were the instructors at the Lenin School, if you know. A. Yes.

Q. What nationalities? A. They were mainly Russian, although there were a number of Germans and there was a sprinkling of other nationalities, mainly Russians, though. I should say a fairly large number of Germans that I met instructed there, and a sprinkling of other nationalities.

6216 Q. Mr. Honig, were the American students at the Lenin School paid while they were in Moscow? A. Yes, they were paid a form of salary while they were there.

Q. Where did the American students live while attending the Lenin School? A. They lived in dormitories operated by the Lenin School.

6217 By Mr. Story:

Q. Mr. Honig, were you paid a salary while you were employed by the Red International of Labor Unions? A. Yes, I was.

Q. What were you paid? A. I was paid 500 rubles a month.

Q. Did you receive any salary in addition to the 500 rubles a month? A. No, I didn't receive a direct salary,

but I was encouraged to receive an extra stipend in the form of royalties in articles I would write for Soviet newspapers and magazines.

Q. Did you write very many articles for the Soviet publications while you were in Moscow? A. Yes, quite a few.

Q. Approximately what was your income from these articles? A. It would range up to about 10,000 rubles a month.

Q. Who paid your salary while you were with the Red Internationale of Labor Unions? A. The RILU.

Q. Where did you live while you were in Moscow? A. I lived in an apartment building operated by the RILU.

6218 Q. Were you charged for your room? A. No, I was not.

Q. Mr. Honig, did you attend any congresses of the Communist International while you were in the Soviet Union? A. Yes, I did. I attended the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International in Moscow in July and August of 1935.

Q. Did the Communist Party of the United States have representatives at this congress? A. Yes, it did.

Q. Do you recall the names of the representatives of the Communist Party of the United States at this congress? A. I remember the name of the Chief delegates. They were Jack Stachel and Earl Browder and William Z. Foster.

Q. Where was the Seventh World Congress held? A. It was held in Moscow, and I believe it was in the Hall of the Soviets in the City of Moscow.

Q. Were you an official delegate from the Communist Party of the United States to the Seventh World Congress? A. I was an official non-voting delegate.

Mr. LaFollette: Do I understand that you attended 6219 the Congress?

The Witness: I attended it.

Mr. LaFollette: You went to the building, but you are not sure what the building was named? Is that it?

The Witness: I am not sure of the English equivalent. That is why I hesitate.

Mr. LaFollette: All right.

By Mr. Story:

Q. Mr. Honig, were you seated with the official delegates from the Communist Party of the United States at the Congress? A. Yes, I sat with them.

Q. What took place at the Seventh World Congress which related to the Communist Party of the United States?

A. To begin with, reports were made by the American delegates, by the ones I named, on the work they had done in the United States, on the work of the American Communist Party, and then a great deal of discussion by the non-American delegates quite frequently centered on the work of the American Communist Party, and in addition to that the main report to the Congress delivered by the leaders of the Comintern, for instance, by Manuilsky, who was the head of the Comintern, touched to a great degree on the work of the American Party.

6223 Q. Who paid the expenses for your trip from the Soviet Union to the United States? A. The Comintern.

Q. Mr. Honig, please tell the Panel, if you know, who paid Foster's expenses for the trip back to the United States?

The Witness: The Comintern.

Mr. Story: How do you know that Foster's expenses for his trip back to the United States were paid by the Comintern?

6224 The Witness: I was with Foster when we visited the Anglo-American secretariat of the Comintern to

obtain the funds with which Foster was to return, and Foster there made the arrangements while I was present to obtain money—

6225 Q. (Mr. Honig, what was said about finances as
6226 far as your trip was concerned back to the United States at this meeting? A. Mingulin told Foster they would immediately arrange to have money for him, and they asked him the date when he wanted to start and said they would have the money by that date.

Q. Was that money for the trip? A. For the trip for the return home to the United States.

Q. Was anything said about expense money for this trip? A. Yes. Mingulin pointed out and wanted Foster to estimate how much would be needed for living expenses for both Foster and myself, and he said that he would find out, Mingulin said he would find out what the expenses would be for the actual transportation, and he would see to it that first-class transportation was provided for both of us.

6227 Q. Mr. Honig, did the Communist Party of the United States receive any other financial assistance
6228 from the Communist International during your membership in the Party?

The Witness: Yes, to my knowledge in a number of cases the Communist Party received direct assistance from the Soviet Union, financial assistance.

6229 Q. What financial assistance did the Communist Party of the United States receive from the Communist International?

The Witness: The Communist Party received a subsidy that I know of directly from the Communist International

which was supposed to go for the operation of "Labor Unity," a magazine which I operated.

Mr. LaFollette: What year?

The Witness: From the years 1930 to 1934.

By Mr. Story:

Q. How do you know this, Mr. Honig? A. I found that out eventually directly from where the assistance was supposed to come, but in the first place I was told by Jack Stachel when "Labor Unity" ran short of money to pay the printer, that William Weiner—

Mr. Abt: Mr. Chairman, if this is a conversation may we have when, where and who was present and what was said?

Mr. LaFollette: I think the witness should be permitted to answer and if he doesn't state so, we will find out when and where. Proceed.

The Witness: In the offices of Jack Stachel at 2 West 15th Street, New York, the headquarters of the Trade Union Unity League, I was told—

Mr. LaFollette: What year?

The Witness: A number of times from 1930 to 1934, almost monthly actually. When I would go to him for money to pay the printer, Stachel told me that he would go to see William Weiner and ask him if the money as subsidy from the Communist International for Labor Unity had yet arrived, and he would so do and come back and tell me whether or not the money was available. Later when I went to the Soviet Union the manager of the Anglo-American department of the Red International of Labor Unions, which was also known as the Profintern, a man named Kutnik asked me if the money which was allotted for publishing Labor Unity had been used for that purpose. I told him that very many times we were not able to get that money, and he told me that he was very angry about that and told me there was a definite stipend assigned for the purpose of publishing Labor Unity, and

the money came from the Anglo-American Secretariat of the Comintern for that purpose, that he would inform the Anglo-American Secretariat of the Comintern that I had told him that we had not received that money regularly.

.

Q. Mr. Honig, you have testified that you knew a 6231 representative from the Communist International in the United States in 1934 by the name of Merker. Did you know any other representatives of the Communist International in the United States during your membership in the Party? A. Yes, I did.

Q. Will you give us the name? A. One was a man named Yuzefovich, Y-u-z-e-f-o-v-i-c-h.

Q. Did you know any other representative of the Communist International? A. I met one named Allen, a man from Finland, a Finn who used the name Allen.

Mr. LaFollette: When and where did you meet him?

The Witness: I met Allen in 1932 and 1933, and I met Yuzefovich frequently in 1932 and 1933 also, in New York City. Yuzefovich also in Pittsburgh.

Mr. LaFollette: What year?

The Witness: The same years. In Pittsburgh it was either in '32 or '33.

Mr. LaFollette: What information do you have for your statement that they were International representatives? You said you met two men.

The Witness: They directly told me so, and later I met Yuzefovich in the Soviet Union and he confirmed again—

.

6232 Q. How do you know that Yuzefovich was a representative of the Communist International?

.

The Witness: Yuzefovich came to visit me in my office in Labor Unity and after telling me that he was a representative of the Communist International—and as a matter of fact he had been introduced to me as such by Jack Stachel.

By Mr. Story:

Q. What position did Jack Stachel hold in the Communist Party at that time? A. He was acting secretary
6233 of the League, and he was a member of the Political Bureau of the Party. Yuzefovich would come to see me and give me instructions on the putting out of Labor Unity. Yuzefovich also would come to the Trade Union Unity League Executive Board meetings which were held monthly. He would attend and listen to the discussion and then give his ruling on whether the decision talked about should be carried out or not. I was present at such meetings.

Q. Did you attend any conventions at which Yuzefovich was present? A. Yes, I did.

Q. What convention? A. It was the convention of the Trade Union Unity League in 1933, I believe it was, but it might have been late in 1932, and it was held in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Q. Were you present at this convention? A. Yes, I was.

Q. Did Yuzefovich participate in the proceedings at this convention? A. Not on the floor of the convention, he did not.

Q. How did he participate? A. He sat back unobtrusively in the back of the hall. He said nothing while the convention itself was going on in the convention itself, but during recesses he would go—a number of times he did so do—

to a nearby cafeteria or cafe or restaurant with Jack
6234 Stachel, with William—with Jack Stachel particularly then, with various heads of unions which were affiliated in the trade union line. I remember Frank Boric, of the National Miners Union and a man named Ziebel, the head of the Shoe and Leather Workers Union of the TUUL, and I would go along as editor of the Labor Unity so I would know what the policy was to be. He would discuss how the convention had gone on this previous session before this particular recess, and he would tell what he

thought of it and what he thought should be done at the next session to eliminate any weak spot that he saw. He would do that during almost every recess of that TUUL convention in Pittsburgh.

Q. You have mentioned that Yuzefovich came to your office in Labor Unity. How often did he come to your office? A. There was no regularity, no stated period, when he felt like dropping in and when he felt the need was there. I can estimate probably a dozen times that he did that.

Q. How long did you know Yuzefovich in the United States? A. About a year.

Q. Did you see Yuzefovich after he left the United States? A. Yes, I saw him in Moscow.

Q. Did Yuzefovich have any position at the time 6235 you saw him in Moscow? A. Yes, I saw him in his office. He was the head of the River Boatmen's union in the Soviet Union, and I saw him in the office of that union. He had a uniform of some kind on. It looked like a naval uniform of some kind, when I met him there.

Q. Mr. Honig, how did you know that Allen, from Finland, was a representative of the Communist International? A. The only time I saw Allen at—I will put it this way: I knew because I saw him at what they call a plenum of the Communist Party in New York, and he was present there and he made a number of talks at this plenum in which he laid down the line to be followed by the Party. That was in 1932, I am pretty sure, late in '32.

• • • • •

6248 Q. Mr. Honig, did you use a party name or an alias at any time during your membership in the Party?

• • • • •

The Witness: Yes, I did.

• • • • •

Q. Mr. Honig, when did you use a Party name?
 6249 The Witness: I used a Party name twice, once when I was in the Soviet Union during my entire stay there, and the second time when I was editor of the Western Worker in San Francisco, when I was managing editor.

By Mr. Story:

Q. What name did you use? A. Nat Davis.

Q. Did you select that name? A. No.

Q. Who selected it? A. On my arrival in the RILU in Moscow, Lozofsky told me that I was to use a Party name during my entire stay in the Soviet Union and that the name of Nat Davis would be the one that I would use.

Q. What position did Mr. Lozofsky have at that time?
 A. He was secretary general of the RILU.

Q. Where in the United States did you use a Party
 6250 name? A. In San Francisco, in my employment on the Western Worker.

Q. What name did you use there? A. Nat Davis.

Q. How long did you use the name of Nat Davis? A. In San Francisco?

Q. In San Francisco. A. During my entire employment on the Western Worker, from approximately April 1936 to August 1937.

Q. Why did you use a Party name while you were employed with the Western Worker? A. William Schneiderman, the District Organizer of the Party for California, told me that they were shaping up or preparing for this general strike on the waterfront in 1936 and that he thought it expedient that I use such a Party name.

.
 6251 Q. Mr. Honig, were you publicly known as a member of the Communist Party during your membership in the Party? A. Not to the public at large. The only non-Communists who knew I was a Party member were

members of my own family and occasional people whom I tried to recruit to the Party.

Q. Were any instructions issued by the Communist Party concerning the concealment of membership in the Party? A. Yes. Communist Party members in their first meetings—

The Witness: In meetings that I attended, in unit meetings that I attended all through my membership in the Party, both I myself when I first joined the Party in my first unit meeting, and subsequently all new members that I saw at Party unit meetings in my unit were instructed by the organizer of that particular unit not to let it be known to the general public that they were Party members.

6252 Q. Mr. Honig, were any members of the Communist Party concealed from the rank and file members of the Party during your membership?

The Witness: Yes, there were.

Mr. LaFollette: Who were they and when and where, specific instances.

The Witness: I can't give you definite names. I can't give you definite dates on that, but I know that it was the fixed policy for certain types of Party members to be concealed as members from the rank and file of the Party.

6253 Q. What type of members were concealed from the rank and file of the membership of the Party? A. People in the professions very often, such as doctors and lawyers, and school teachers quite often. That type generally.

Mr. LaFollette: If you don't know their names, how do you know that these people were concealed? Where did you get your information?

The Witness: I do know the names. I do know some names.

Mr. LaFollette: During your membership?

The Witness: Yes.

Mr. LaFollette: On the West Coast or in New York?

The Witness: The West Coast is one example I remember.

6254 By Mr. Story:

Q. Will you give us that example? A. There was an attorney named Leo Gallagher who was a Party member on the West Coast.

The Witness: The attorney, Leo Gallagher, I know was a Party member in my entire period on the Western Worker, and was hidden from the General Party membership.

Mr. LaFollette: On what factual basis do you say you know he was a Party member?

The Witness: In the first place, I was informed so by the District Organizer of the Communist Party, so I would know how to treat Leo Gallagher in the columns of the Western Worker.

6255 Q. Were any other types of members of the Communist Party concealed from the rank and file of the membership?

The Witness: It requires a little thought for a minute or two. Yes, there was another type. I referred to that type before, namely, representatives from the Comintern who were in the United States. They were Communist Party members.

6256 THE WITNESS: I also remember Americans who were used as couriers abroad, whom I met in Moscow

—I mentioned Tim Ryan—who were not known to the Party members of the United States as Party members at least an attempt was made to cover up that fact.

Q. Mr. Honig, did you know any labor leaders who were members of the Communist Party?

THE WITNESS: A great many.

Q. Were the leaders of the trade unions who were members of the Communist Party generally known as members of the Communist Party to rank and file of the Party?

6257 THE WITNESS: They were only so known to a limited section of the rank and file of the Communist Party. The fact was not to be mentioned. At least I was given instructions, as editor of Labor Unity, that the fact was not merely not to be mentioned, but to be denied if the occasion arose—these were my instructions—in Labor Unity, that such leaders were members of the Communist Party, and only to the members of a fraction of their particular unit, the Communist fraction of their particular union, were they known as Communists.

Q. Mr. Honig, did you receive any instructions concerning the disclosure of your membership in the Communist Party at any time?

THE WITNESS: I did when I joined the Party and I believe I have testified to that. Then I did when I joined
6258 the staff of the Daily Worker. Robert Minor, the editor, told me, took me aside when I became a member of the staff and told me that since I was a new member and I was pretty well unknown to the Party at large in New

York and to the public in general; whereas some of the other older members of the staff were not so unknown, it would be a good idea for me to not let it be known too generally that I was a Party member to the rank and file of the Party itself and certainly not at all outside the Party, and also he said they feared raids by the police at that period on the Daily Worker premises and in that case, in the case of such a raid if I were questioned by the police, I would say I was just a visitor there or that I was leaving an article there— Oh, just generally to give the idea that I happened to be there on business other than that of an outright member of the staff or a Party member.

Q. Mr. Honig, were you called upon to testify in any proceeding involving the Communist Party during your membership in the Party? A. Yes, I was.

Q. Will you give us the date? A. I can't give the exact date. It is a matter of record. But it was in, I believe, 1932 or 1933.

Q. What was the case? A. It was a case in which a "6259" Communist-controlled union was involved.

THE WITNESS: The union was the Shoe and Leather Workers Industrial Union. An injunction was being sought against the union. The important point in whether that injunction would be issued or not turned out to be whether this union was communist-controlled or not. I was asked by Jack Stachel, or I was instructed by Jack Stachel, to appear as a witness for the defense in that proceeding.

By MR. STORY:

Q. Did you appear in the proceeding? A. Yes, I did.

Q. Did Stachel give you any other instructions prior to the time you appeared as a witness in this case? A. Yes. He said that the purpose of my appearing there would be to try to prove—to make the assertion or claim that this Shoe

and Leather Workers Industrial Union and the Trade Union Unity League were not affiliated or connected in any way with the Red International of Labor Unions. He said that a number of cases of this kind had occurred and that affiliation had proved very embarrassing to the case of the unions

and that the TUUL was going to use a new tactic
6260 to try to get around this. He said we were to drop—

that up to this time we had said in our masthead, "Labor Unity, official organ of the Trade Union Unity League, affiliated with the Red International of Labor Unions." He said we were now going to drop that phrase "affiliated with the Red International of Labor Unions."

Then when I was to testify I was to point out that the Shoe and Leather Workers Industrial Union and the TUUL were not affiliated with the RILU and to show as a proof of that the lack of such affiliation on the masthead of the Labor Unity.

Q. Did you ~~you~~ discontinue this phrase on the masthead of Labor Unity? A. We did shortly before, some time before my appearance on the stand.

Q. Did you testify in the case? -A. Yes, I did.

Q. Was the testimony you gave in this case true or false?

6261. THE WITNESS: The testimony I gave in respect to affiliation with the RILU was false.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: What did you testify with reference to?

6262 THE WITNESS: I testified that the TUUL and, through it, the Shoe and Leather Workers Industrial Union, was not affiliated with the RILU, and I pointed out as proof of this that such affiliation was not stated on the masthead of the official organ of the TUUL, Labor Unity.

By MR. STORY:

Q. Did you give any testimony concerning the Communist control of this union?

THE WITNESS: No.

6263 MR. LAFOLLETTE: You used a term a while ago in answer to a question by Mr. Story with reference to Communist control, particularly of this union. What facts do you predicate your statement on that it was controlled by the Communist Party of the United States?

THE WITNESS: I knew the President of the union, Sam Ziebel, and I had met many times with him at Communist meetings. I met with him monthly at the TUUL executive board meetings where he accepted the instruction of Communist leaders. I knew him personally as a Communist. We spoke to each other as fellow Communists. We just spoke that way. We knew who we, each other, were.

By MR. STORY:

Q. Mr. Honig, what was the TUUL? A. The TUUL is the initials for the Trade Union Unity League. It was an organization founded by the Communist Party for the purpose, in the first place, of splitting off as many workers as possible from the AF of L unions and forming them into unions of the TUUL, controlled by the Communist Party. Another purpose it was formed for was to organize workers who were unorganized who were not in any unions up to that time into such Communist-controlled unions. And also to take such workers both from the AF of L and the un-
6264 members of the Communist Party.

Q. Mr. Honig, were the meetings of the Communist Party of the United States open to the general public during your membership in the Party?

6265 THE WITNESS: I hadn't finished the answer. There was one type of meeting conducted by the Communist

Party that was open to the general public. They were the election rallies, the election meetings, at which candidates of the Communist Party, who were running for office on the Communist ticket, spoke. Such meetings were open to the general public. But I don't recall any other type of Communist Party meeting that was open to the general public.

6266 Q. Were you given any instructions concerning your allegiance as a member of the Communist Party?

THE WITNESS: I was not given instructions in allegiance. I was given instructions that my allegiance only was to the Soviet Union and was not to the United States of America.

By MR. STORY:

Were you present when any other members of the Communist Party received any instructions concerning allegiance?

THE WITNESS: Yes, I was. Of course this occurred at all unit meetings of the Communist Party that I attended in my entire membership whenever new members were introduced to the other members and when they were given their first instructions as to the duties of a Communist Party member.

6267 MR. LAFOLLETTE: What language was used?

THE WITNESS: The language used was that we as Communists owe our allegiance to the workers' fatherland, which is the Soviet Union, our first and only allegiance; that we owe no allegiance to any capitalist form of government.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: Were you ever a unit leader yourself?

THE WITNESS: Yes. I was a discussion leader in the first unit I joined.

By MR. STORY :

Q. Mr. Honig, did you attend any meetings in Moscow where the subject of allegiance of the members of the Communist Party of the United States was discussed? A. I did.

Q. Will you tell the panel about this meeting? A. A preliminary meeting to the Seventh World Congress of the Comintern was held in the Cominter, a meeting of the American delegates, and a talk was given by Manuilsky, the head of the Comintern at the time, in which he introduced the subject by pointing out of course at that time that the main enemies, the most imminently threatening enemies of the Soviet Union were Nazi Germany and Japan, but he proceeded to give the American delegates a very severe lecture and he said, "You, the American Party leaders, seem to

have forgotten in the course of our current struggle
6268 against Nazi Germany and Imperialist Japan, that still of course the American capitalist government, as he called it, "that still this is a foe of the Soviet Union, of the workers' fatherland. You seem to have forgotten to stress that you owe your first allegiance or that all Communist Party members in the United States owe such first allegiance to the workers' fatherland, the Soviet Union."

He demanded that that be re-stressed again to the lowest ranks of the Party.

6269

By MR. STORY :

Q. Mr. Honig, you were testifying about a meeting in Moscow prior to the meeting of the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International. Do you recall the names of the Americans who were present at that meeting?

A. Of most of them. At that meeting were Browder, Stachel, William Z. Foster, and William Schneiderman. These were the chief delegates. I recall them distinctly being there. John Williamson is another.

6284 Q. Mr. Honig, what were you taught as to the ultimate aim of the Communist Party of the United States during your membership?

Mr. ABT: I object.

Mr. LaFOLLETTE: I think I will let him answer that, if he states by whom and where specifically the teaching took place. The objection is overruled. Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: I was taught from the inception of my membership as soon as I joined the Party, and I was taught this in the first place by the unit organizer of the Communist Party when I joined in 1927, that the ultimate aim of the Communist Party of the United States was to overthrow the form of government existing in the United States then, and that any means would justify that ultimate aim, including the use of force and violence, if necessary.

By Mr. STORY:

Q. Was that the policy that was taught in the Communist Party all during your membership? A. Yes, it was.

Q. What form of government was to be set up in the United States to replace the present form of government?

A. What I was taught and what I myself taught and was told to teach was that the aim was to set up a dictatorship of the proletariat patterned on the form of government existing in Russia, in the Soviet Union.

6304

CROSS EXAMINATION

6401 Q. Mr. Witness, you testified here that you went to various unit meetings of the Communist Party, did you not? A. Yes.

Q. And that at these unit meetings you taught the advocacy of the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence, is that right? A. That I was taught and I so taught, yes.

6402 Q. Did you testify on the question of force and violence in the Bridges case? A. I did.

Q. Did you give this testimony, were you asked this question at page 2228?

"Question: Is it not a fact that you yourself believed in the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence?"

Were you asked that question in the Bridges case? A. Yes, I was asked that.

Q. And your answer?

"Answer: I had to believe that—Yes, I did. I necessarily believed that in a major part of the time that I was in the Party as a Party member."

Did you make that answer? A. Yes, I did.

Q. Then were you asked this question:

"You do now, don't you?"

Were you asked that question? A. Yes, I was.

Q. "Answer: I do not." A. Yes, I said that.

6403 Q. Were you asked this question:

"When did you stop believing that?"

Were you asked that question? A. Yes, I was.

Q. Did you make this answer?

"Answer: I stopped believing that as far as my own mind was concerned, oh, perhaps a year and a half, two years before I left the Party. And, as a matter of fact, I discussed that with Party officials and I had told them that—I had told them that I was coming to think that such kind of action to achieve social change would not be necessary, and I pointed out certain reforms being made by the National Administration. And they said—they pointed out 'Well, you don't necessarily have to believe that. It's quite possible that in the United States'—this was not writings, this was personal conversations with me—'It is quite possible in the United States and even probable that there wouldn't have to be force and violence, because all the rest of the world would have done so meanwhile, and all the rest of the thing would fall in our laps.'

"Well, that kind of sustained me, kept me in the Party for a while, plus the assurance of the leading members of the Communist Party."

6404 Did you give that answer?

Q. Were you asked that question and did you make that answer? A. Yes. I made that answer.

6405 Q. Then were you asked this question:

"Question: Then is it your testimony that from 1927 to approximately 1937 you did believe in the forcible and violent destruction of the Government of the United States?

"Answer: I would put my belief in that period you mentioned in this way. What I believe was this: That—"

Did you have that question and did you start making that answer in that form? A. Without the benefit of the record, I can't answer.

By MR. MARCANTONIO:

Q. "Question: Can't you first answer the question 'Yes' or 'No' and then if you want to qualify it, you can make as many qualifications as you like?"

Then Mr. Del Guercio interposed a remark and the Presiding Inspector said:

"I think he can answer it. Let's see if he can answer it."

Then did you make this answer:

"Answer: I don't believe I can definitely say 'yes' or 'no' on that question."

Did you make that answer?

6406 THE WITNESS: Yes.

By MR. MARCANTONIO:

Q. Were you asked this question?

"Question: All right. If you can't say either 'yes' or 'no', go ahead and speak."

Then do you recall giving this answer?

"Answer: What I believed from the day I joined the Communist Party, oh, for say the next nine or ten years was this: That the Communists could work as far as possible towards transition, towards socialization, in that quite possibly at some point when they got near the point, say, where the masses of the people of the country were ready for a change in the system, for doing away with capitalism as a system, at that time they would be in such a great majority and indicate it so plainly that there might not be the necessity for any kind of struggle or violence.

"I thought that there were maybe a 75 per cent chance that that could happen, and many Party leaders told me that. But I did believe, however: That in case such a situation arose and the organization of the workers that were desirous of that change made it plain to those in control of capitalism that they wanted to achieve a system of socialization now, and if those in control of the capitalist organizations, the capitalist system as a whole, met them with violence then I did believe, and I sincerely believed that it would be necessary for the working class to resort to violence because they were being met with it."

Did you make that answer, Mr. Witness?

THE WITNESS: With all the "mights" and "buts" and "possiblys," I remember making such an answer substantially.

By MR. MARCANTONIO:

Q. I am asking did you make that answer, Mr. Witness.

A. Yes, including all the mights and buts.

Q. Never mind the might's and but's. I will show you the answer. Did you make it? A. You don't have to show it to me.

Q. But you did make this answer that I read, Mr. Witness? A. Yes.

Q. Then were you asked this question?

"Question: That is counter-violence after violence first used by some other side?"

And did you make this answer?

6408 ~~Answer:~~ Answer: Yes. That was really my belief. But, nevertheless, I must say openly that it was a belief in the use of violence to achieve that aim."

Did you make that answer? A. Yes.

6409 Q. Were you asked this question?

"During the period that you have held the beliefs that you have just described, did you consider your beliefs to be consistent or inconsistent—"

Get this, Mr. Story.

"—with the teachings and advocacies of the Communist Party?"

Do you remember being asked that question? A. I believe so.

Q. Did you make this answer?

6410 "Answer: I believed them to be largely consistent because, first of all, I had discussed these questions with leading members of the Communist Party, men like Foster, men like Stachel, who were members of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Party, and in cases even in some Communist writings it has been mentioned that in a country like the United States it might be possible that, well, the capitalists would have no fight left in them in this country because the capitalists in the other countries had been overcome. And I kind of rather like to choose to believe those statements rather than the contradictory statements on that subject appearing probably in

the same work by men like Lenin and so forth. Perhaps it was just a matter of wishful thinking on my part." Did you make that answer, Mr. Witness?

THE WITNESS: Yes, I made that answer.

6488

Redirect Examination

By Mr. Story:

Q. Mr. Honig, how long was the general strike in 1934 on? A. The general strike of all the unions involved, not just the Longshoremen?

Q. Yes. A. I don't recall the exact period. I know it started in July 1934, I believe. The general strike, as far as participation by all the original unions, lasted I believe less than a week. It collapsed within a week, as I recall it.

Q. Did you receive any report from the Communist Party of the United States as to why the general strike was called off? A. Yes, I did.

Q. What reports did you receive from the Communist Party of the United States?

THE WITNESS: I received a report from the Communist Party that the general strike, not of longshoremen but of all the unions involved, had collapsed shortly afterwards because Vandaleur and O'Connell and George Kidwell, leaders of the American Federation of Labor, had denounced, had decided that the strike had been prepared by the Communist Party and that the Communist Party had too active a part in the preparation, and therefore they had decided to pull out of it and to call their unions out of the strike.

By Mr. STORY:

Q. Did those unions pull out of the strike? A. A great many of the American Federation of Labor unions pulled out of the strike very shortly after it was called.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: How do you know that?

THE WITNESS: This report stated so.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: How many reports did you get?

THE WITNESS: I can't say. There were quite a number of reports on this particular phase.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: From whom did the reports come?

THE WITNESS: I received reports from Jack Stachel, signed by Jack Stachel, and there was at least one report signed by Earl Browder.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: On the subject matter—

6504 THE WITNESS: On what they called the betrayal of the general strike.

By Mr. STORY:

Q. What positions did Stachel and Browder have at that time? A. Browder was the head of the Communist Party. I believe his title was secretary-general or secretary of the Communist Party. Jack Stachel, I think then he was acting head of the Trade Union Unity League, acting secretary of the Union Unity League, and both were members of the Political Committee of the Communist Party.

6517 Dr. Philip E. Mosely called as a witness for Petitioner, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

Direct Examination

By Mr. LENVIN:

Q. Will you please state your name and address. A. My name is Philip E. Mosely, of New York City, 29 Clairmont Avenue.

Q. What is your present position, Dr. Mosely? A. I am Director of the Russian Institute of Columbia University and Professor of International Relations at Columbia University.

Q. How long have you held this position? A. I have been Director of the Russian Institute since February 1, 1951. I have been Professor of International Relations at Columbia University since July 1, 1946, on active duty from September 1, 1946.

Q. Prior to your appointment as Professor of International Relations at Columbia, what other positions have you held? A. In 1929-30 I was Instructor of History at 6518 Princeton University. From 1933 to 1935 I was Instructor in History at Union College in Schenectady, New York. From 1936 to 1942 I was first assistant professor and then associate professor at Cornell University, at Ithaca, New York.

Q. After 1942? A. From June 1942 until the end of August or the first week of September 1946 I was employed by the Department of State. From June 1942 until about April 1943 I was a senior research analyst in the Department of State, first in the Division of Special Research and then in the Division of Political Studies. From about April 1943 until January 1944 I was assistant chief in the Division of Political Studies, from January 1944 until September 1945 I was chief of the Division of Territorial Studies. From September 1945 until I resigned at the beginning of September 1946 to return to academic work, I was special assistant to the Assistant Secretary of State. During that time I attended the Moscow Conference of three foreign ministers in October 1943 as a member of the United States delegation. From June 1944 until August 1945 I was political adviser and deputy representative of the United States delegation to the European Advisory Commission in London. In July and the beginning of August 1945 I was a political adviser to the U. S. Delegation to the Potsdam Conference. From September 1945 until the end of August 1946 I was a 6519 political adviser on the U. S. delegation to the Coun-

cil of Foreign Ministers meeting in London and Paris. From February 1946 until May I was the U. S. Commissioner on the Four-Power Commission for the investigation of the Yugoslav-Italian boundary. During July and August 1946 I was the U. S. representative on the Commission for the Drafting of the Statute of the Free Territory of Trieste and the Convention of the Free Port of Trieste.

Q. Dr. Mosely, would you give the panel, please, a brief description of your educational background? A. Yes. I was born and brought up in Westfield, Massachusetts. I was born in 1905. I was educated in the public schools of Westfield, graduating from the High School in 1922. I studied four years at Harvard College, 1922 to '26, receiving my degree, A.B., summa cum laude in 1926. In 1926 and 1927 I studied at Cambridge University in England under a fellowship from Harvard College, doing my work principally with the late Professor H. V. W. Temperley, the co-editor of the British documents on pre-1914 diplomacy and the author of the principal work on the Paris Peace Conference of 1919.

In 1927-28 I was employed in England and France as a private tutor in an American family, and at that time I took some informal work at the London School of Economics and at the Free School of Political Science in Paris, Ecole Libre. At that time I also began a thorough study of Russian as a school to begin my later research in Russian history. In 1928-29 I did graduate work at Harvard University in European history and received my M.A. in history in 1930. After a year of teaching at Princeton, I received a fellowship in history from Harvard and went to Moscow, where I carried on research in Russian diplomatic history from July 1930 to April 1932, returning to Harvard in September 1932 and completing my Ph.D. degree in June 1933. The subject of my dissertation was Russian Diplomacy and the opening of the eastern question in 1838 and 1839. The major part of this study was published in the following year by the Harvard Press which also published

some eight or ten articles on other aspects of Russian diplomacy of the 1830's.

In 1935 and 1936 I received a post-doctoral fellowship from the Social Science Research Council and carried on studies in to village life in three Balkan countries, Roumania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia. This involved interviewing the peasants in the villages, studying their family and village organization and customs. I published several articles on these problems.

Q. Dr. Mosely, do you speak, read or write any language other than English? A. Yes. I speak, read and write French and Russian. I read and speak German. I read and speak Serbo-Croatian and Roumanian. I read and understand some Italian and some Bulgarian, and I can read 6521 with a dictionary Czech, Polish, Ukranian, Spanish, Portuguese and Dutch.

Q. During the period of time that you have been engaged as Professor of International Studies at Columbia have you had occasion to be appointed to any consultative positions? A. During the period since 1946 I have occasionally served as a consultant to the Department of State on the Russian and European problems.

Q. Are you serving in any consultative capacity to any organization at this time, other than your work connected with Columbia University? A. Yes. I am now consultant to the Social Science Division of the Rockefeller Foundation. Beginning in January 1947 I served as a consultant. Then in April 1948 I was appointed a part-time assistant director in social sciences. I resigned that as of July 1, 1951, because of the pressure of other work and my research. I am continuing, however, as a part-time consultant. From 1938 to 1945 I was the Secretary of the Committee on Slavic Studies. This was a national committee appointed by the American Council of Learned Societies to assist in developing research and research resources and teaching in the general field of Slavic studies. In December 1945 I was made Chairman of this committee and in February 1947

this committee was reorganized as the joint committee on Slavie Studies, appointed jointly by the American Council of Learned Societies and Social Science Research Council. I served as Chairman of this Joint Committee from February 1947 until I resigned in September 1950 in accordance with the principle of rotation.

From 1941 to 1945 I was also a member of the Committee on Intensive Language Instruction in the Emergency, a committee appointed by the American Council of Learned Societies to try to fill some of the gaps in our equipment to provide people with a knowledge of unusual languages ranging from Swahili to Japanese and Burmese and Thai, African, Russian, Chinese and so on. This was a private committee appointed by this leading council for the purpose of trying to meet this need for knowledge of what might be called out-of-the-way languages.

Q. Dr. Mosely, do you recall the titles under which you published some of your more important written works? A. I have published a study of Russian diplomacy toward Turkey and the Turkish Straits in the 1830's entitled "Russian Diplomacy and the Opening of the Eastern Question in 1838 and 1839," published by the Harvard Press. I translated and edited and abridged a history of the Russian Revolution titled "The Great Russian Revolution," by V. M. Chernov, which was published by the Yale University Press in 1936. I published studies of Russian diplomacy of the 1930's including a study of Russian policy toward the Spanish Civil War at that time, the Russian policy toward Persia and Afghanistan, and I published a number of studies of intellectual work in Russia, including in 1938 a study in the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science entitled "Freedom of Scientific Inquiry and Artistic Expression in the Soviet Union." In 1950 I published in the proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, at Philadelphia, a study of social science and the conditions that have influenced its development in the Soviet Union since the war. I have also published studies in For-

eign Affairs, the Yale Review, and a number of other periodicals of a scientific and general character.

6524 Q. In connection with the various positions you have held and the studies that you have undertaken, have you had occasion to examine the publications and other materials issued by the Soviet Government or the leaders and spokesmen of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union or the leaders of the Comintern in matters which relate to the International and Foreign policies of the Soviet Union?

A. Yes, I have. This is my principal line of research and has been both in its historical and contemporary aspects for more than 20 years. I am probably the only full professor in this country who is devoting his full time to teaching and research on Russian and Soviet foreign policy. I follow the development of Soviet foreign policy from day to day and I also try to gather in retrospect additional information to be used in my teaching and in research.

Q. Also, Dr. Mosely, have you had occasion to examine and study publications and other materials issued by the Communist Party of the United States? A. Yes, I have. I have consulted these materials frequently and have often referred to them in my research work.

6531 Q. Dr. Mosely, have you also in the various positions which you have held and the research that you have undertaken had occasion to examine the publications and material issued by the States of Roumania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Poland and Albania? A. Yes, I have. I have not been able to examine them with the same regularity, largely because there are many gaps in the flow of materials, even those representing the point of view of the governments in those countries, but I have examined very substantial and typical parts of their publications setting forth the foreign policy of those governments.

Q. Have you also read with any degree of regularity the

publication issued by the Communist Information Bureau entitled "For a Lasting Peace for a People's Democracy"?

A. Yes, I have followed this publication from the time it began in November 1947, first issued in Belgrade, and then from July 1948 from Bucharest.

6533 Q. Dr. Mosely, from your examination of the materials and other publications emanating from the Soviet Union have you been able to form any opinion as to the views and attitudes of the Soviet Union toward the League of Nations during the period of approximately 1919 to 1934?

6535 THE WITNESS: I have, sir.

6540 Q. Dr. Mosely, from your examination of the materials and other publications emanating from the Soviet Union have you been able to form any opinion as to the views and attitudes of the Soviet Union toward the League of Nations during the period from approximately 1919 to 1934? A. I have.

Q. What is that opinion that you have formed?

THE WITNESS: From 1919 until the end of 1933 the leaders of the Soviet regime and of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and of the Communist International attacked the League of Nations very bitterly. They described it as a league of robbers, an imperialist conspiracy, as a conspiracy to unleash a new war, as a plot to enslave dependent peoples, and particularly as a conspiracy to attack the Soviet Union and to destroy it. This opinion was expressed on innumerable occasions through speeches and other published pronouncements of the leaders of the Soviet regime, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and of the Communist International.

Q. I show you, Dr. Mosely, what is a certified translation of an article appearing in Izvestia for May 13, 1919, page 1, entitled "The League of Violence," and ask you whether you have ever read that statement before? A. I have read the statement. I have read it several times in Russian and I have examined this translation. It is a typical statement of Soviet criticisms of the League of Nations and its whole concept and activity.

6551 Q. Dr. Mosely, this newspaper Izvestia, which you have examined—Do you know anything about this publication? A. Yes, I do. Izvestia in 1919 was the official newspaper of the Soviet of Deputies of the Toilers of Soviet Russia.

Q. In your opinion, would statements appearing in this publication reflect the official views of the Government?

THE WITNESS: The editor of Izvestia is appointed and removed by the Soviet Government and it is regarded in the Soviet Union and outside as the official mouthpiece of the Soviet Government.

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. Referring again to this issue of Izvestia, a translation of which I showed you, Mr. Mosely, I would like to ask again in your opinion does this article fairly reflect the attitude of the Soviet Union toward the League of Nations as of the date of this article.

6552 Q. Does it reflect the views and attitudes of the Soviet Union toward the League of Nations as of that date?

THE WITNESS: This statement in Izvestia represents only one of numerous and continuing expres-

6554

sions of official Soviet opinion concerning the League of Nations in 1919 and in subsequent years down to the end of 1933 or the beginning of 1934. It is a complete attack on the whole conception, notion, organization and alleged aims of the League of Nations.

By MR. LENVIN :

Q. I also show you, Dr. Mosely, an excerpt from works by Joseph Stalin, Volume 10, August-December, 1927, published in Moscow in 1949. I specifically direct your attention to this excerpt which appears on pages 206 and 207, which I would like to offer as petitioner's exhibit for identification No. 164.

(The document referred to was marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit 164.)

By MR. LENVIN :

Q. I ask you whether you have ever read that before. A. I have. I have read it many times both in the original Russian version of Stalin's Collected Works and in this translation.

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, does this excerpt which I have shown you reflect the attitude of the Soviet Union toward the League of Nations as of that date?

6355 THE WITNESS: It does in my opinion. Stalin was then the Secretary-General of the Communist Party Bolshevik of the Soviet Union and a member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party. This statement of his views has been published many times since the conference was held in November 1927. One of the most recent versions in Volume 10 of his Collected Works was issued by direction of the Central Committee of the Communist Party in 1949. Therefore, it must be assumed that it is an authoritative opinion of his views as of the time that he expressed them.

6359 Q. Dr. Mosely, in your examination of the publications and other materials which have been issued by the Communist Party of the United States, have you been able to form any opinion as to what the views and attitude of that Party was toward the League of Nations during the period from 1919 to 1934? A. I have. Through its publications the Communist Party of the United States commented frequently and in great detail on the League of Nations and its activities and thus there is abundant materials to form an opinion.

Q. I show you, Dr. Mosely, an editorial, which appeared in the Daily Worker for December 19, 1925, entitled "Pacifist Propaganda for World Court," which we would like to identify as Petitioner's Exhibit 165, and ask you if you have ever read that editorial before. A. I have. I have read this editorial before.

(The document referred to was marked Petitioner's Exhibit 165 and received in evidence.)

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, does that editorial reflect the views and attitude of the Communist Party of the United States toward the League of Nations as of that date? A. It does.

6569 Q. Dr. Mosely, to what extent have your research in the positions that you have held required you to read and study publications issued by the Communist Party of the United States, the Respondent in this case? A. I read extensively the publications, past and present, of the Communist Party of the United States. This means that for extensive periods I read their daily and monthly publications, such as the Daily Worker, the Sunday Worker, Political Affairs, formerly The Communist. Then at other times in the course of my research review over a period of some months or several years their expressions of view on a given problem. In other words, I read exten-

sively currently and also I have occasion in the course of my own research and of supervising the research of others, to review the past expressions, for example; on a given international problem. I will go back through their publications over a period of anywhere from one to 20 or 30 years, depending on the nature of the subject. In my work I supervise the research training and actual research of anywhere from 15 to 30 graduate students in any given year, and at the present time there are 18 candidates for the Ph.D. who are preparing their dissertations under my supervision. So in many cases I also have occasion to advise them in their research and to review the materials which they bring out in the course of their research. In other words, my research facilities are much more extensive than those of just one single person. It represents a whole series of studies in the course of which I have occasion to supervise closely the review of the materials of the Communist Party of France or the Communist Party of Germany or the Socialist Unity Party of Eastern Germany or the Workers Party in Poland or the Communist Party in India, and so forth.

I would say it is not possible for one person to read 6571 and follow all the publications of all the parties, but that naturally those in languages accessible to me, which I have listed previously, I do follow them closely at first hand and also through supervision of the reference to these materials on the part of conscientious and able graduate students.

Q. Now, Dr. Mosely, have you been able to form any opinion as to the views and policies which the Communist Party of the United States had toward the League of Nations from the time of its establishment to about the year 1934?

THE WITNESS: Yes, I have. During this period the Communist Party of the United States attacked the League of Nations as a league of robbers, as an imperialist conspiracy, as a plot to attack and overthrow the Soviet Union. The

terms in which they attacked the League of Nations were directly parallel to the terms in which the Soviet Press and other public pronouncements—

6572 Q. You may continue, Dr. Mosely. A. The arguments, the line of reasoning, the accusations brought against the League of Nations by the publications of Communist Party of the United States were directly parallel with the accusations which appeared in Soviet 6573 official pronouncements and in the Soviet Press and other publications of the Soviet Union.

Q. I show you, Dr. Mosely, Petitioner's Exhibits 165 and 166 and ask you if you have taken into consideration in arriving at your opinion these two articles.

6575 Q. The question was: Have you taken into consideration these articles, which have been identified as Petitioner's Exhibits 165 and 166, in forming your opinion as to the views and attitudes and policies, of the Communist Party, USA, toward the League of Nations as of the period we have under discussion?

6576 THE WITNESS: I have.

Q. Now, Dr. Mosely, did there come a time after 6595 1934 when the views and policies of the Soviet Union underwent a change toward the League of Nations?

A. Such a change occurred in 1934.

Q. What was the occasion for such a change, if any?

THE WITNESS: In September 1934 a large group of nations represented in the League of Nations extended an invitation to the Government of the Soviet Union to join the

League of Nations. The Soviet Government accepted this invitation and in September 1934 joined the League of Nations. This change had been foreshadowed by an interview which Mr. Stálin gave at the end of December 1933 in which he stated that the attitude of the Soviet Government toward the League of Nations need not always be contradictory or hostile, that under certain conditions the League of Nations might now play a positive role in preventing the spread of war and aggression, and that under those conditions 6596 the League of Nations might receive Soviet support.

The reasons for the Soviet change of view were further elaborated by the then People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Litvinov in his speech of acceptance of membership in the League of Nations, including a permanent seat on the League Council. Here he spoke in terms of approval of the League of Nations, placing—

6597. Q. Now, Dr. Mosely, I ask you whether, in forming your opinion as to the views and attitudes of the Soviet Union toward the League of Nations after it became a member, you took into consideration these items which have been marked as Petitioner's Exhibits 167 and 168. A. I did. They are authoritative expressions of the view of the Soviet Government. One item is the official text of the reply of the Soviet Government to the President of the Assembly of the League of Nations, and the other is an authoritative speech by the then People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs, the authorized spokesman of the Government of the Soviet Union on foreign policy.

6599 Q. Dr. Mosely, from your examination of the publications and other material issued by the Communist Party of the United States, have you been able to form any opinion as to the views and attitude of that Party toward the League of Nations after 1934 or after the Soviet Union became a member of the League of Nations?

THE WITNESS: I have. After the Soviet Government joined the League of Nations, the Communist Party of the United States praised the League of Nations as a potential obstacle to the expansion of war and aggression and stated that the League had now been strengthened because of the adherence of the Soviet Government to it. The terms in which it now described the League of Nations were parallel to the expressions of views as advanced by Soviet officials and by the Soviet Press.

6600

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. In connection with your arriving at this opinion, Dr. Mosely, I show you petitioner's Exhibit No. 169 and direct your attention specifically to an article entitled "The Seventeenth Anniversary of the October Revolution," appearing in The Communist for November 1934.

Q. I ask you whether you took that article into consideration in arriving at your opinion regarding the views and attitude of the Communist Party toward the League of Nations after the Soviet Union became a member of the League of Nations.

6604 **THE WITNESS:** My answer to the last question is that I did take this article into account in forming my opinion as I read it both at the time and have read it since.

Q. Now, Dr. Mosely, did there come a time when the Soviet Union again changed its official attitude toward the League of Nations? A. Yes, in December 1939 the Soviet Government changed its attitude. It now attacked the League of Nations as an organization for the spreading of war, for the promotion of aggression, and for the organizing and planning of an attack upon the Soviet Union.

6605 Q. Dr. Mosely, I show you what is being marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification 170.

6606 Q. I ask you whether you have ever read this article before. A. Yes, I have. I read it shortly after it was published in Russian, and I read the translation.

Q. Now I ask you, Dr. Mosely, whether in forming your opinion as to the attitude of the Soviet Union toward the League of Nations at the end of 1939 you took into consideration this article. A. I did. This is an announcement by the official Soviet Telegraph Agency, published widely in the Soviet daily and periodical press at the time. It therefore must be presumed to represent the official view of the Soviet Government concerning the expulsion of the Soviet Union from the League of Nations on the occasion of the attack upon Finland.

Q. Dr. Mosely, in your examination of the materials and other publications issued by the Communist Party of the United States, have you been able to form any opinion as to the attitude, views and policies of that party toward the League of Nations after December 1939?

6607 A. I have.

THE WITNESS: The official press of the Communist Party of the United States now attacked the League of Nations because of its expulsion of the Soviet Government. It defended the action of the Soviet Union in attacking Finland. In its exposition and argument on these events in 1939 its expressions of opinion and the policies which it advocated paralleled those of the Soviet official press and the Soviet Government.

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. In arriving at that opinion, Dr. Mosely, I ask you whether you took into consideration this article appearing in the Daily Worker for Saturday, December 16, 1939, which is a re-print of the text of Earl Browder's address at the Peace Federation at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. A. Yes, I did. I read this at the time and have read it since.